

Index to Minutes of Meeting
The Commission of Fine Arts
11 March 1954

American Battle Monuments Commission	
Memorial Chapel at Carthage, North Africa	7
Arlington Memorial Amphitheatre	
Awning for	10
Army, Department of the	
Korean Service Medal, revised models for	9
Central Intelligence Agency	
National Security Medal, model of	8
Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company	
Georgetown Building, design for	10
E Street Bridge, proposed	
Congressional Hearings on	1
Foggy Bottom Development	7
Freer Gallery of Art	
Acquisitions by Purchase	13
Marine Memorial, United States	
Inscription for	2
Landscape plans for	6
Meridian Hill Park	
Development of	6
Nevius Tract and its development	3
Postage Stamps, new	
Design competition	11
Shipstead-Luce Act Submissions	
SL 1622-Shoreham Hotel Extension	
remodel the entrance	10
SL 1619-1220 E Street, N. W.	13
SL 1620-401 13th Street, N. W.	13
SL 1621-627 15th Street, N. W.	13
SL 1623-500 New Hampshire, N. W.	13
Veterans of Foreign Wars, Headquarters Building	1

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., March 11, 1954

The sixth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1954, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday, March 11, 1954. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Belluschi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. Biddle,
Mr. de Weldon,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on January 28, 1954, were approved.

2. HEADQUARTERS BUILDING FOR THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS: The Secretary reported that he had been advised by the firm of Holabird, Root and Burgee, architects, of Chicago, that they are designing a headquarters building, which is to be faced in marble, for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to be located on the east side of Union Station Plaza; it will be about opposite their International Teamsters Union Building, which is now under construction on the west side of Union Station Plaza. They expect to submit the drawings to the Commission of Fine Arts in about six months.

3. HEARINGS ON THE PROPOSED "E" STREET BRIDGE: Chairman Finley reported that on Wednesday, March 10th, he testified before a Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives and in behalf of the Commission of Fine Arts read into the record a letter of Protest (Exhibit A).

The letter was based on a Resolution which the Commission adopted at a meeting held on March 28, 1952.

There were several witnesses who testified against the project. First was Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, in charge of National Parks; Joseph Grew, President of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association and Hermann Hagedorn, Secretary and Director of the Association; Harland Bartholomew, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission and others. Congressman Smith of Virginia said it was a waste of time to expect that Congress would take affirmative action in this matter, since it would repudiate the action by Congress regarding Roosevelt Island. The Congressman suggested that the Committee forget the E Street bridge proposition and begin considering what is to be known as the "Roaches Run Bridge" east of the railroad bridge.

4. INSCRIPTION FOR THE UNITED STATES MARINE MEMORIAL: Mr. de Weldon submitted prints of the full sized drawings for the Marine Memorial. They cite the service of the Marines in campaigns and Wars of the United States from the time of the Revolutionary War in 1775. The inscription will be 180 feet in length. The following is a list of the wars and campaigns in which the Marines took part (Exhibit B).

Mr. de Weldon explained the prints in detail, and said, "There are no letters on any joints and no names or figures go around the corners. I have also a sample of the Marine Corps insignia as it will appear on one of the panels. There will be two insignia facing each other with center inscription in the middle. Each panel of the inscription represents one slab of stone."

Professor Belluschi criticized the wording "given their lives since 10 November, 1775." Mr. de Weldon considered this to be a good criticism. It is to read November 10, 1775, leaving out the word "since." The matter will be brought to the attention of the Marine Corps Board.

Mr. Peets remarked, "I question whether you can cut those serifs as sharp as that in granite." Mr. de Weldon replied, "In Swedish granite you can. It is very fine grain." Mr. Peets then remarked, "All right; then I question whether you should. It seems to me that those are type serifs. They are very sharp. In fact, they look more like the Reed pen cursive letter." Also, Mr. Peets was doubtful about "that leaf ornament partly because it seems a little congested." Mr. de Weldon said he would give it some further study.

Mr. Neild raised the question, "Do you need the dot between the words, as indicated? Won't there be too many spots?"

Mr. Peets said, "That is what makes the numbers and the letters readable, the spaces in between. The spacing is just as important as the design of the letters. In the ancient Roman inscription they did not have any space between them; you just had to recognize the words."

As to the insignia showing the eagle, Mr. Peets said, "It looks too much like a dove." Mr. de Weldon remarked, "You should consider the blank part inside the eagle itself. The gold will only bring this out. This is really the eagle's face, not the outer contour. When it is carved it will appear entirely different."

5. NEVIUS TRACT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT: Chairman Finley stated, "You remember at the last meeting, gentlemen, we either decided to send, or debated about sending a letter to the Secretary of the Interior making clear our position with reference to the location of other memorials on the Nevius tract. Perhaps this letter should have gone sooner, but I have been away and the letter is now ready to go. So, I might read it and send it if you approve:

"My dear Mr. Secretary:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on December 17, 1953, the Office of National Capital Parks submitted a design suggesting the location of the United States Marine Corps War Memorial on the Nevius Tract, north of the Arlington National Cemetery. The Commission

approved the site generally and a report was sent to the Office of National Capital Parks, accordingly, at that time. There were two other suggested memorials indicated on the plan above mentioned: one, a Memorial to the Five Freedoms, the other a site for the proposed Carillon Tower.

"The Commission of Fine Arts did not take action with regard to these two proposed memorials. As set forth in the report made to the Office of National Capital Parks: As for possible sites for other memorials on the Nevius Tract, the Commission of Fine Arts felt that this should be made the subject for further study and that it is one that would be given further consideration by the Commission sometime in the future.

"The definite location agreed upon is the one which was recommended by the sculptor of the Memorial, Mr. Felix de Weldon, and is indicated on the landscape plan prepared by Mr. Horace W. Peaslee, which was submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held on January 28, 1954, and approved. That site is the one at which the ground-breaking ceremony took place on February 19, 1954. The Commission of Fine Arts feel that further study should be given to the question of location of the proposed memorial to the Five Freedoms and to the question of location of the Carillon Tower.

"For The Commission of Fine Arts;

Sincerely yours,
Sgd. David E. Finley,
Chairman."

Mr. Peets said, "Mr. Chairman, I have to confess that I had written out a draft on the same topic on an entirely different approach, not as a letter but as a kind of analysis from the planning point of view and that was one of the two documents, one or two meetings back, that I had some idea of proposing to you; there isn't anything in the Memoranda that I wrote out that conflicts with the letter, except in the sense that it is stronger and more explicit in its recommendations."

Chairman Finley replied, "I think this letter is just putting on notice that we have not approved locating the other two memorials on this Tract, namely the memorial to the Five Freedoms, and the Carillon Tower."

The Secretary reported that the Carillon Bells, about 50 of them, have arrived from Holland--the largest is 7 feet high and weighs 7 tons. They have been placed temporarily in the Polo Field of East Potomac Park.

Thereupon Mr. Peets read his Memorandum (in the presence of Mr. Peaslee, who was invited to attend (Exhibit C). and C-1

The Commission considered the Memorandum to be excellent. The Commission felt that either the proposed letter to the Secretary of the Interior be made stronger, or that the Memorandum by Mr. Peets be attached to the draft read.

Mr. Peaslee said that according to a newspaper report the Carillon bells and Tower are being considered for Potomac Park, but that subsequent inquiry at the Office of National Capital Parks did not confirm this.

Mr. Peets remarked that at the present time it is to be a temporary tower, 30 feet square and 40 feet high, approximately, "a concrete mass, so they can actually hang the bells in it and play on them and have people hear them. That will run on for years until the money is available for the construction of a permanent tower at that point." Mr. Peaslee said the tower is to be a gift from the Dutch people. "They are giving the whole thing."

Mr. Neild asked, "Do you think some attention will be given to the design of the temporary concrete tower, which is liable to remain there indefinitely?" Mr. Peaslee replied, "It is to be in concrete with steel frame."

Thereupon there was some further discussion regarding the Nevius Tract, and the two additional memorials proposed for it.

Dr. Hudnut suggested saying to the Secretary of the Interior, "We would like further time in which to consider this matter," according to report cited.

Chairman Finley said: "I want to let him know we did not take action with regard to the two memorials, and add another sentence and say that we are sending this Memorandum which gives our ideas as to how the tract should be developed."

Dr. Hudnut commented: "That is quite enough, I should think."

A letter was sent to the Secretary of the Interior, accordingly (Exhibit D).

6. LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR THE UNITED STATES MARINE MEMORIAL: Mr. Peaslee said, "This, for your general information, is the plan which you approved in principle. There have been subsequent developments. The first development was that the National Park Service found that they did not own the property which had been turned over to them. That much was lost (indicating). The second development was that the Planning Commission advised that there was a State Highway encroachment and that wiped off this corner here (indicating). Then we worked along and now I would like to get approval of the final plan. This (indicating) is the development as it stands at this time. In all we have had about nine or ten studies. This plan is the one we are now submitting as the final plan."

A considerable number of comments and suggestions were made concerning the plan. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit E). Also, a report was sent to the Marine Memorial Association (Exhibit E-1).

7. MERIDIAN HILL PARK: Mr. Peaslee called attention to a Memorandum on the development of Meridian Hill Park adopted by the Commission of Fine Arts in 1939, a copy of which had been sent to each Member of the Commission, with a print of the Park, together with a supplemental Memorandum prepared by Mr. Peaslee a few days ago. He called attention to certain details, particularly sculpture, that have not been attended to during the past 15 years. The Commission decided to review the Memorandum and visit Meridian Hill Park at the next meeting.

Mr. Peaslee pointed out three possible locations for the proposed Carillon Tower—(a) on the Great Terrace (removing the Jeanne d'Arc statue to another location in the Park); (b) at the north end of the Upper Garden, which would place it near the Embassy of the Netherlands; (c) a site which, he said, Mr. Peets has advocated "very strongly and it is entirely off any relationship

to the formal scheme,--would be over in this section (indicating)." A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit F).

8. **FOGGY BOTTOM DEVELOPMENT:** The Secretary reported that the J. W. Harris Company, of Rockefeller Center, New York City, desire to submit plans for part of the Foggy Bottom Development at the west end of the city; however, there are Zoning Height problems involved and a report has been awaited from the National Capital Planning Commission, but none has as yet been received. The Commission decided that the matter should be deferred, in the circumstances, until the next meeting, in April.

Mr. Peets said that the representative of the firm present, Mr. Churchill, is an old friend, and explained the situation to him. This was agreeable to Mr. Churchill.

9. **AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION:** The Secretary reported the receipt of two letters of complaint,--one from Senator Margaret Smith, of Maine, the other from Senator Lehman, of New York, as to a reported action by the Commission in refusing to accept Henry Varnum Poor as the collaborating painter, with Moore & Hutchins, architects, of New York, for the Memorial Chapel at Carthage, North Africa.

Chairman Finley said that he talked with Admiral Kinkaid about this matter; he is the Vice Chairman of that Commission. They meet on March 18th, when, it is expected, this matter will be brought before the Commission.

Mr. Biddle said he felt very gravely about this whole matter, and that there is keen disappointment in the art world about it.

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts reasserted their confidence in the ability of Mr. Poor, who is one of the outstanding artists and mural painters in this country; and recalled that he rendered very good service as a member of the Commission of Fine Arts from 1941 to 1945.

The Commission decided that the Chairman should send a letter to Admiral Kinkaid, expressing the views of the Commission of Fine Arts in this matter (Exhibit G).

10. NATIONAL SECURITY MEDAL: Colonel Robert M. Gaynor, Chairman, CIA Honor Awards Board, Central Intelligence Agency, submitted a plaster model for the National Security Medal. The model was made at the United States Mint in Philadelphia. Colonel Gaynor said that this is a medal intended for both civilian and military award. "It was established by Executive Order of the President a year ago, January 19, 1953. That is for any outstanding contribution in the field of intelligence. Recommendations for it normally are submitted to the National Security Council and then in turn under our procedure to us for consideration. But it is, as I think Mr. de Weldon knows, intended for both military and civilian presentations."

There was criticism about the "point of piercing." Colonel Gaynor said, "The point stops lower down. It was also pointed out by Mr. Roberts yesterday that they had brought these points out a trifle more so that the enamel when filled in would come out to about what the original design shows. With the disappearing point of the metal itself it would be inconspicuous, but the colored enamel would be brought out. That would be about the same proportion that was intended in the original medal. Mr. Roberts and Mr. Gaspari of the Philadelphia Mint were enthusiastic about the design themselves. They thought it had all the earmarks of making an effective medal. The medal is awarded rarely; fifty will last us, at the present experience rate, ten years. There have been very few awards so far."

Some further discussion followed. Thereupon, on motion of Mr. de Weldon, seconded by Mr. Biddle, the Commission approved the model (Exhibit H).

Also the Commission approved "a little device that will appear on the ribbon if the medal is awarded a second time" and model thereof.

11. KOREAN MEDAL: Mr. Arthur E. DuBois, Chief, Heraldic Branch, Research and Development Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, Department of the Army, in company with Thomas Hudson Jones, sculptor, in his office, submitted revised models of the proposed Korean Service Medal, with letter, as follows:

March 11, 1954

QMGRH 421.4
Commission of Fine Arts.

Gentlemen:

In accordance with the suggestion made in your letter of 23 October 1953, there are forwarded herewith additional studies (revised models) of the proposed Korean Service Medal design.

The Department of the Army has expressed a preference for the design which was characterized by the following features:

(a) Obverse: Balustrade on sides of central arch-way fades into medal background. Archway stylized.

(b) Reverse: Color fields in Korean device not scored but separated by indented line.

Your advice as to the merits of the design of medal described above will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
Sgd. ARTHUR E. DUBOIS, Chief
Heraldic Branch
Research and Development Division.

"

Mr. DuBois displayed the models and said, "The obverse showing an open gate or door is symbolic. As for the reverse, it is a symbol signifying eternity, taken from the Korean flag and means Tah Gook."

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. de Weldon, seconded by Mr. Neild, the Commission approved the revised models above mentioned (Exhibit I).

Mr. Peets added, "With the suggestion that you consider a slightly wider open, or deeper line" (referring to the model for the reverse). Mr. DuBois commented, slightly deeper and wider incising in there (indicating). We can do that without any trouble at all.

12. **AWNING FOR THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATRE:** Under date of February 19, 1954, the Commission received the following letter from Colonel John D. Martz, Jr., Chief of the Memorial Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, U. S. A.:

The Office of the Quartermaster General has received from the Military District of Washington a proposal that a canopy covering the sidewalk and leading up to the steps to the west entrance of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheatre be authorized to afford protection during inclement weather to dignitaries who arrive at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The canopy would be stored when not actually required.

A drawing of the canopy was submitted and the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts was requested.

The Commission inspected the design and approved it, and its use subject to the condition above-mentioned(Exhibit J).

13. **CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE BUILDING, OLD GEORGETOWN:** The Secretary submitted a design drawn by Leon Chatelain, Jr., architect, of Washington, for a bomb proof Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Building, to be built in Old Georgetown, south of M Street and adjacent to Wisconsin Avenue. It will be faced with red brick to be in keeping with the community. In the event of bombing, it will be the only dial telephone building available for telephone service in the city.

The design has been considered by the Committee of Architectural Consultants on Old Georgetown and approved by them.

The Commission inspected the design and approved it.

14. **SHOREHAM HOTEL EXTENSION:** The Commission considered a design (Shipstead-Luce Act Submission No. 1622) received from the Building Inspector for remodeling the entrance to the Shoreham Hotel.

Professor Belluschi inspected the design in detail, and approved it with the recommendation that the pylons shown at the entrance be faced with brick rather than stucco. The Commission concurred.

15. NEW POSTAGE STAMPS: During the afternoon the Commission discussed a Program of Competition drafted by the Post Office Department (Exhibit K), a copy of which the Secretary had sent to each member. In general it was declared to be not at all satisfactory, and the Commission unanimously recommended that the Post Office Department authorize, at this time, the appointment of Dr. Fiske Kimball, Director of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, as the Professional Advisor, before anything further is done to amend the draft of the Competition.

The Commission were convinced that no recognized artist would compete without knowing who would constitute the Jury. There was doubt as to an interpretation of the term "American way of life." As to this Mr. Biddle said:

"I believe that this somewhat narrow range of schematic subject matter and style might frighten away artists who might be otherwise splendidly qualified to make beautiful, appropriate, designs. Could some qualifying phrase be used such as, for instance, that the designs may be treated realistically or with extreme abstraction; other appropriate themes might include "Our One World," "Transportation by Air, Land, and Sea," the Birds and Beasts Native to our Country," and of course any idea germane to the Postal Service."

Professor Belluschi expressed some doubt as to the advisability of stressing the question of subject matter too much; nevertheless, he said, "I don't know, I may be wrong." Also, he said, "It is not clear to me what is meant by "black and white wash drawings" since water colors expressly are not included. Dr. Hudnut suggested using the word "monotone," as did also Mr. Peets. Then, too, he objected to allowing the Post Office Department to buy designs for \$300, saying \$300 would be a very small sum.

Dr. Hudnut advised that the Program of Competition be rewritten, saying

"I think the important thing is to persuade the best artists to compete, and to do that two or three things are essential. In the first place, the Program must be written with infinite care and precision; every word must be carefully chosen so it is definite and clear what the competitor's rights are and how it is going to be judged, and to be spelled out by someone who is a professional.

"The second requirement is that the man who is going to run it, his name will have to be known at once so that the artist will have

not to be guided by the opinion of some inexperienced clerk in the Post Office Department or some vague commission, but the man; that is the key to any competition, the confidence of the competitors in the man who is running it. Therefore, the jury should be named in advance in the Program because the best artists want to know that. These are questions they ask. They want to know how it is going to be conducted, what the requirements are, who is going to do it. Then I think that the right to object to a design is disastrous to a good artist. A good artist must be paid the \$1,000 for the winning design; that must be mandatory. He is not going to submit a design that the jury can reject and pay nothing for it. You may have 20,000 designs from little boys who are going to select stamps, if that is what you want; but the busy men are not going to—what they want is the acclaim of it.

"The \$1,000 is a substantial fee, but it is not going to persuade a first-class artist to go into this competition unless he has the conditions such as will make it possible for him to win,—unless he has a jury that will recognize the design and a manager who will see to it that there is fair play. But this revised Program we have here does not cover those requirements. In the matter of purchasing a design for \$300, that should be a question of contract and negotiation between the artist and Department. As I stated in my Memorandum, 'The Government reserves the right to purchase any design at a price to be agreed upon.' That puts the artist in a position of bargaining with the Department. It is his design. He can withdraw it. But if he is obliged to sell it for \$300 he will not compete, and he can refuse to sell it. But the first thing to do now is to appoint a professional advisor. And Fiske Kimball should be informed of the things we are recommending this afternoon."

Mr. de Weldon then suggested the following:

"I would suggest when the artists have made the large-sized sketches of the stamps they ought to have a small sketch of the actual size of the stamp, because then it will give them a better idea to form their composition so it will be actually designed for the small stamp. That is, the original design should be made for the small size and then they make a reduction on the large scale because only what they can do in the small size will be suitable after they make the perfect drawing on the large scale, in the small size the design has to be. It has to be prominent enough so that after they make their real drawings when reduced to small size to be still composition for miniature, not a picture reduced."

Chairman Finley said, "That could be incorporated among the suggestions to Fiske Kimball."

Thereupon, the Commission decided to draft a letter to be sent to Mr. Robertson.

However, before sending the letter, Mr. Finley decided to have a talk with Mr. Robertson about the matter. (Exhibit K-1)

16. FREER GALLERY OF ART: The Commission called at the Freer Gallery of Art, where the Director, Mr. Wenley, submitted a number of works of art proposed for purchase. The Commission were pleased to inspect them and approved them for purchase (Exhibit L).

17. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS: The Commission inspected a number of plans received from the Office of the Building Inspector, and took action as follows:

No. 1619, 1220 E Street, N. W. The Commission inspected the drawing, and disapproved it. Letters should be studies more carefully and be less bulky. Revised design requested.

No. 1620, 401 - 13th Street, N. W., also one on Pennsylvania Avenue side of new building. The Commission inspected the drawing and disapproved it. Letters should be studied more carefully and be less blocky; also the Commission advised leaving out a crude motif shown in the center of the sign.

No. 1621, 627 - 15th Street, N. W., opposite the Treasury Department, at 15th and G Streets, N. W. The Commission recommended restudy of the lettering to improve the composition.

No. 1623, Sign for 500 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W. Approved.

The Building Inspector was notified of the action taken in these cases.

18. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold the next meeting in Washington on Thursday, April 8, 1954.

Also Thursday May 6th, and Thursday, June 10th, were tentatively agreed upon for meetings of the Commission of Fine Arts those months.

The Commission adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

C O P Y

STATEMENT OF DAVID E. FINLEY AT E STREET BRIDGE HEARINGS
MARCH 10, 1954

I should like to preface my remarks by saying that the members of the Commission of Fine Arts fully appreciate and sympathize with the difficulties faced by the District Commissioners in trying to meet the traffic problems that arise in this city. In any recommendations that we may make, we try to be helpful and constructive, not obstructive, as regards any plans that may be proposed to meet these problems. Our responsibility, however, is to advise, not as to the most practical solution for facilitating the flow of traffic, but as to the effect of proposed plans on the appearance of the city from an aesthetic point of view.

We feel that the erection of a large, utilitarian bridge across Theodore Roosevelt Island would seriously impair the appearance of the Mall and of the approaches to the Lincoln Memorial. It seems to us of the utmost importance to protect the integrity of the park system, which provides such a beautiful setting for the public buildings and other monuments here, and also makes available recreation areas to the people of Washington and others visiting this city.

As the Capital of a great nation, the city of Washington belongs to all the people of this country, who have a deep and abiding interest in preserving the dignity and beauty of the public buildings, the monuments, and the park areas which make Washington one of the most beautiful cities in the world. These considerations should not be sacrificed in order to achieve a solution of traffic problems which arise in this as in other cities, especially those with large suburban areas and a constant flow of commuters in and out of the city.

For the reasons given above, the Commission of Fine Arts feel obliged to recommend against the erection of a bridge at Theodore Roosevelt Island, and have asked me to transmit their views in a letter which I should like to read and, with your permission, to have incorporated as a part of the record of this hearing.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 1, 1954

My dear Mr. Chairman:

The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful study to H. R. 6876, a Bill "To Authorize and Direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to Construct a Bridge over the Potomac River and Theodore Roosevelt Island in the vicinity of E Street, and for other purposes."

The members of the Commission are concerned about the aesthetic values involved in the construction of the proposed bridge and its effect on the park system in Washington and especially on Theodore Roosevelt Island.

This island constitutes an important part of the Potomac River Basin which terminates the Mall and forms the setting of the Lincoln Memorial, the Memorial Bridge, and the approaches to Arlington Cemetery. The island was given to the people of the United States by the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association and was accepted by the Congress as a memorial to President Roosevelt to be maintained as a sylvan reserve.

In the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts, the construction of a highway bridge across Theodore Roosevelt Island would seriously reduce, if not destroy, its value to Washington and the Nation now and in the future as a permanent preserve of natural scenery. It would also change the character of a memorial dedicated to one of our great Presidents. Furthermore, it would mar the beauty of the landscape setting of the Lincoln Memorial and the adjacent area, which form an integral part of the Central Composition of the City of Washington.

We hope, therefore, that some other solution may be found for the difficult and pressing traffic problems that exist in this section of the city.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Hon. Carroll D. Kearns, Chairman
Committee on the District of Columbia
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

def/pav

I should like to make one further observation. In this case there is another very serious objection to the proposed bridge across Theodore Roosevelt Island, which I should like to point out in my capacity as an individual, and not as Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts; and that is that the Government should never violate covenants entered into with its citizens who have made gifts to the Government, such as Theodore Roosevelt Island.

Exceptions to this rule should be made only in the case of dire necessity, when the public safety is involved, as in time of war. In the present case, it might be convenient to utilize Theodore Roosevelt Island for a bridge crossing in the hope of improving traffic conditions. To do so, however, would establish a precedent that would be, in my opinion, most unfortunate and might deter other donors who might wish to make gifts to their Government. More important still, such a precedent might also encourage undesirable changes in the fundamental plan of the city of Washington, with results that cannot now be foreseen and which might have disastrous consequences to the appearance of the city in the future.

Mr. Felix de Weldon
2500 Q Street, N.W.
Washington 7, D.C.

My dear Mr. de Weldon:

The Commandant of the Marine Corps has approved revised lettering to be inscribed on the United States Marine Corps War Memorial and has directed me to forward this information to you. As approved by the Commandant the revised inscription should read as follows:

Revolutionary War	1775-1783
French Naval War	1798-1801
War with Tripoli	1801-1805
War of 1812	1812-1815
Florida Indian Wars	1835-1842
War with Mexico	1846-1848
War between the States	1861-1865
War with Spain	1898
Philippine Insurrection	1898-1902
Boxer Rebellion	1900
Nicaragua	1912
Vera Cruz	1914
Santo Domingo	1916-1924
Haiti	1915-1934
World War I	1917-1918
Bellevue Wood	
Aisne-Marne	
St. Mihiel	
Blanc Mont	
Meuse-Argonne	
 r Nicaragua	 1926-1933
World War II	
Pearl Harbor	1941
Wake Island	1941
Bataan and Corregidor	1941-1942
Midway	1942
Guadalcanal	1942-1943
New Georgia	1943
Bougainville	1943-1944
Tarawa	1943
New Britain	1943-1944
Marshall Islands	1944

Marianas Islands	1944
Peleliu	1944
Iwo Jima	1945
Okinawa	1945
Korea	1950

The inscription in the center of one side of the base of the Memorial should read:

In Honor and in Memory of
 The Men of the
 United States Marine Corps
 who have given
 Their lives to their Country
 Since 10 November 1775

The inscription within the wreath on the other side of the center of the base of the memorial should read:

Uncommon Valor
 was a
 Common Virtue

With all best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOEL D. THACKER
 Marine Corps Historian

C O P Y

Notes on Design Criteria for the Nevius Tract
Prepared by Elbert Peets, Landscape Architect
Member and Received by the Commission of Fine
Arts at the meeting of March 11, 1954

The most obvious aesthetic value of the Nevius Tract is that it is part of Arlington Hill, the impressive wooded background of the Mall. The Tract forms a particularly important part of that landscape, as it is now the northern-most part of the Hill in public ownership.

The line of the Mall axis, extended, runs through the Nevius Tract. But an observer stationed west of the Lincoln Memorial, as for instance near the Watergate, rarely directs his vision along the true line of the axis. The axis crosses the river at an angle, but the observer tends to look straight across. He accepts the Memorial Bridge as carrying the monumental feeling of the Mall across the Potomac to the Arlington Cemetery and the Lee Mansion and thence down the river. He has no sense of anything lacking in the plan on account of the absence of any physical marker of the axis on the other side. His mind is wholly absorbed in the beauty of the Bridge and the powerful spacial flow of the river.

Yet it is now seriously proposed to build on the Nevius Tract a new formal group of structures designed around an extension of the Mall axis.

The proposal indicates a misunderstanding of the purposes and technique of axiated planning. The crude centering of structures on a straight line has no aesthetic virtue. It is the design of the space in which the monuments stand, or of the subsidiary spaces connecting the structures, that gives the composition unity and rhythm. The lateral walls formed of buildings or trees, and the parallel lines of the ground pattern, perform the vital function of carrying scale from one structure to another. Serving as measuring-sticks, these supporting features help us in perceiving the size of the monumental structures and the extent of the spaces between them. Without this framework of perspectives we would lose the repose that comes with certainty of size and position. Without it, too, axiation is pointless and other means should be used to demonstrate size and relative location.

Further, and no matter how the plan may be organized, a monumental composition must have an emotional content. And that content cannot come from an inscription or from some guidebook story; it must be an irresistible flood of feeling from the buildings and open spaces themselves. The emotional expression of the monuments must become a harmony of feeling just as the structures form an architectural unity.

An annex to the Mall, separated from it by a mile of water and traffic interchanges, could not possibly have anything in common with the Mall, either architecturally or in sentiment. It would be a separate thing and had much better be built in some place where it would not be a parasite on the perfection and completeness of the Mall as we know it.

The irrationality of extending the Mall axis is demonstrated by the fact that views of the Mall buildings, as seen from the Nevius Tract at points near

the axis line, are not beautiful and produce no feeling of continuity with the Mall. They are, indeed, confusing and unsightly, due to the absence of any perspective lines or other aids by which the spacing of the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument and the Capitol can be perceived.

In such views the Capitol dome is partly or quite hidden by the Monument and the lower part of the Monument is hidden by the Memorial; in some light conditions the Monument has the awkward appearance of being a part of the Memorial. From other points in the Tract when the sunlight is bright the little dome atop the Library of Congress seems to float grotesquely above the Memorial. It should be remembered, too, that in the Nevius view one sees the rear of the Lincoln Memorial. It is an impressive and beautiful mass but it neither expresses strong axiation nor welcomes crowds of people, as does the front of the building. The west side of the Memorial is the end of the Mall.

Since the primary value or function of the Tract is that of strengthening the forest background of the Mall, every effort should be made, by grading and planting, to foster tree growth. This applies especially to the west boundary, where apartment houses have been and will be built. This does not mean, of course, that open areas cannot desirably be maintained at appropriate points between tree masses and on the lower slopes.

The Tract also presents an unusual opportunity in landscape architecture, that of making full use of the fine views the site affords--views of the river and city and especially the off-axis views of the Mall structures. There could be walks at lower and higher levels, the best vistas being emphasized in various ways, with possibly an outlook tower placed among the trees and rising to their tops. These should soon make it a popular place of tourist pilgrimages.

Any buildings that may be located on the site should preferably be kept low, dark in color, and broken in mass.

The question may be raised as to whether the Marine Memorial, which has been allocated a site on the Nevius Tract, will meet the design criteria suggested above. On this point it should be noted that the Memorial, in all long views, will always be seen against trees. It should also be noted that the pedestal will be of black stone, that the bronze will be neutral in color and will be broken up into relatively small masses. If the planting is done in a way that harmonizes with the mixed forest growth that covers Arlington Hill, the Marine Memorial should not unduly detach itself from the predominately wooded area that forms such a perfect background for the Lincoln Memorial and the Mall. That is the basic design criterion proposed in this study.

NEVIUS TRACT DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Finley: You remember at the last meeting, gentlemen, we either decided to send or debated about sending a letter to the Secretary of the Interior making clear our position with reference to the location of other memorials on the Nevius tract? Perhaps this letter should have gone sooner but I have been away and the letter is now ready to go. So, I might read it.

"My dear Mr. Secretary:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on December 17th, 1953, the Office of National Park Service submitted a design suggesting the location of the United States Marine Corps War Memorial on the Nevius tract, north of the Arlington National Cemetery. The Commission approved the site generally and a report was sent to the Office of National Capital Parks accordingly at that time. There were two other suggested memorials indicated on the plan above mentioned; one, Memorial to the Five Freedoms, the other a site for the proposed carillon tower.

"The Commission of Fine Arts did not take action with regard to these two proposed memorials. As set forth in the report made to the Office of National Capital Parks as follows: as for possible sites for other memorials on the Nevius tract, the Commission of Fine Arts felt that this should be made the subject for further study and that it is one that would be given further consideration by the Commission some time in the future.

"The definite location agreed upon is the one which was recommended by the sculptor of the memorial, Mr. Felix de Weldon, and is indicated in the landscape plan prepared by Mr. Horace W. Feaslee which was submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held on January 28, 1954, and approved. That site is the one at which the ground-breaking ceremony took place on February 19, 1954. The Commission of Fine Arts feel that further study should be given to the question of location of the proposed memorial to the five freedoms and the question of location of the carillon tower."

Mr. Feets: Mr. Chairman, I have to confess that I had written out a draft on the same topic on an entirely different approach, not as a letter, but as a kind of analysis from the planning point of view and that was one of the two documents, one or two meetings back, that I had some idea of proposing to you and there isn't anything in the memoranda that I wrote out that conflicts with that except in the sense that it is stronger and more explicit in its recommendations.

Mr. Finley: I think this letter is just putting on notice that we have not approved locating the other two memorials on this tract. At the hearing the other day there was some mention by Mr. Harry Thompson of the fact that probably they would put these two memorials here.

Mr. Caemmerer: The bells are here.

Mr. Finley: He seems to be taking it for granted that it is going to happen but I think it well to put him on notice that we have not approved it. Your memorandum, I think, we will be glad to hear it now, or circulate it and then when the question comes up on the question of location of the other two memorials, we would need it at that time.

Mr. Feets: Very good. May I send the document which I have in my pocket to you for you to read and decide what use should be made of it?

Chairman Finley: All right. Would you like to read it or would you rather circulate it?

Mr. Feets: It is three typewritten pages.

Chairman Finley: Why don't you read it now, then, if you like? Is this the time to consider it? Does it deal with the location of the other two?

Mr. Feets: It argues against building anything that affects to be an extension of the Mall.

Chairman Finley: Would you like to hear the memorandum now?

Mr. Neild: I suggest that we do.

Chairman Finley: Why don't you read it, if you will?

Mr. Feets: Yes, thank you, I will be glad to. The form of it is fairly in harmony with my idea that when questions come up which can be anticipated it is highly desirable to make a study in advance and to have an approach, at least, to the problem and that such an approach can sometimes be put into writing and be of use when the problem arises.

Mr. Caemmerer: Would there be an objection to having Mr. Feaslee hear this? He is outside.

Mr. Feets: That would be very nice --

Mr. Caemmerer: All right.

Mr. Feets: so far as I am concerned.

Chairman Finley: Do you suggest Meridian Park?

Mr. Feets: No, but it does concern the Marine Memorial on which he is working.

Chairman Finley: On which Mr. Feaslee is working?

Mr. Feets: ~~Exc~~ Yes sir.

Chairman Finley: Good morning, Horace. We are discussing the

question of location of any other memorials on the Nevius Tract.

Mr. Feets: Notes on the Nevius tract: (Note: Mr. Feets proceeded to read the memorandum which is attached to the Minutes as Exhibit C).

Mr. Feets: As you see, that is very different from the letter that you are writing and I do not know why that should not be filed, let us say, for reference and your letter go off provided it is strong enough to impress the Commission's opposition to any monumental construction at that point.

Chairman Finley: I think that is an excellent memorandum. We ought to, it seems to me, we ought to file it and keep it ready for use at the appropriate time. You feel that this letter is not pointed up, that we should express to any other memorials at this time? Perhaps it should be done as the case arises, if they come up with a proposal to locate another memorial there, then we would pass on it.

Mr. Feets: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if you would read the paragraphs that define the things we advise against.

Chairman Finley: Speaking of the location of the Marine Memorial, the Commission approved the site and a report was sent to the Office of National Capital Parks accordingly at that time. That dealt only with the locating of the Marine Memorial. There were two other suggested memorials indicated on the plan above mentioned; one, a Memorial to the Five Freedoms, the other a site for the proposed carillon tower.

"The Commission of Fine Arts did not take action with regard to these two proposed memorials. As set forth in the report made to the Office of National Capital Parks as follows: as for possible sites for other memorials on the Nevius tract, the Commission of Fine Arts felt that this should be made the subject for further study and that it is one that would be given further consideration by the Commission sometime in the future."

Then it does on about the Marine Memorial.

Mr. Caemmerer: That is a notice to the Secretary of the Interior advising him specifically that the Commission have not approved the site for the carillon on the Nevius tract.

Mr. Peaslee: Advise as to whether that is or is not being considered for the Potomac Park, West Potomac? There was a newspaper report that it was to go down there.

Chairman Finley: They are trying it out.

Mr. Feaslee: It said permanent.

Mr. Peets: I was going to suggest that, I would say that the carillon tower on the Nevius tract is a thing of the past.

Chairman Finley: I hope so, I think it is unsuitable for that tract

Mr. Feets: Good news.

Chairman Finley: I think we ought to consider the fact that they may propose another memorial, to soldiers or great soldiers or something which would not be unsuitable for the Nevius tract provided it is not too obtrusive, too prominent in the site. Something on the order of the Mraine Memorial, on a smaller scale, perhaps, but if they proposed a memorial to some general adjoining Arlington Cemetery, it would not be objectionable, having such a memorial. That would be different from putting up a memorial to five freedoms or a carillon down there and I wonder if we ought to take the position that we would not approve any other memorial on that tract or wait until specific cases arise? They say it is a permanent site but I say it has not been brought to this Commission if they intend to put the carillon tower south of the polo field and I should think we would have to approve it.

Mr. Feets: The tower that they are going to build at the present time is a temporary construction but a very heavy construction, 30 feet square and 40 feet high, something like that, a concrete mass, so they can actually hang the bells and play on them and have people hear them. That will run on for years until the money is ready for the construction of a permanent tower at that point.

Chairman Finley: Do you know if it is lack of funds to provide a permanent tower? I thought the Netherlands' Government is giving money for the tower.

Mr. Feets: The items I read in the newspapers did not develop that, did not definitely say that it was a financial matter, but I judge so from the way in which it was referred to.

Mr. Feaslee: The Dutch gift is the tower?

Chairman Finley: The tower itself? Have they provided the funds?

Mr. Feaslee: They are giving the whole thing.

Chairman Finley: If money were available it would seem to be a pity not to decide on a permanent site and build a tower instead of putting money into this temporary thing.

Mr. Feets: Or perhaps for political reasons the Dutch did not want to go to such expenditure even if it has the money because the people at home still have troubles enough without contributing to a bell tower in Washington. But I judge from the articles in the papers it was definite that they were not going to build the permanent tower at this time.

Mr. Neild: Do you think some attention will be given to the design of the temporary concrete tower which is liable to remain there indefinitely?

Mr. Feaslee: Steel frame on concrete. I thought it would be a steel frame on concrete raft.

Mr. Feets: I had that impression, too. I believe it is steel.

Mr. Feaslee: When the Planning Commission considered this plan for the first time in February, at the February meeting, they asked the National Park Service to bring forward their plan for the whole Nevius tract so they could judge this plan in relation to what might be done there. Nothing was produced.

Mr. Belluschi: It is a fact that Mr. Thompson came in with a drawing showing the Five Freedoms. It seems to me that we ought without going too much into detail say that symmetrical monumental solutions of a conglomeration up there would not be best and let it go that way or simply say that the Commission disapproved that particular scheme so that they would not be any locations. This is not too clear whether we approve or disapprove it but if we can say we disapprove that scheme that was presented to us by Mr. Thompson --

Chairman Finley: We just said in the letter that the Fine Arts Commission does not take action with regard to these two proposed memorials as set forth in the report made to the Office of the National Capital Parks. Our report did not say we disapproved them but just took no action.

Mr. Feaslee: Could ~~we~~ not view with alarm, could you?

Mr. Belluschi: I think you should be alarmed somewhere, stuck in because it was really very bad not only from the point of view that was just expressed in this memorandum, but purely from the composition itself.

Chairman Finley: Would you like to say the Commission of Fine Arts is not prepared to approve the location of these two proposed memorials?

Mr. Belluschi: As submitted.

Chairman Finley: As submitted.

Mr. Neild: I would say so.

Mr. Hudnut: I think the time might be quite ripe to submit with your letter the memorandum of Mr. Feets, a general statement of our feeling. I do not see why that would not be a good thing to have in the record and to have copies sent to the Planning Commission or other people interested. It is a very clear and surely just statement of how we feel. And why don't you go ahead with the letter and attach this to it and we will take our stand on this generalization, then you have got that to refer to whenever this question comes up, on the basis of discussion.

Chairman Finley: I think it might be useful for them to have this memorandum as guidance, any ideas they may develop for this tract. I see no reason not to do that. Do the rest of you think that is a good idea?

Mr. de Weldon: Yes

Mr. Biddle: Yes

Chairman Finley: Elbert, if you will give us the memorandum, we will

enclose it in the letter. I would change the wording here to say that the Commission of Fine Arts is not prepared to approve the location, would that meet everyone's approval?

Mr. Hudnut: A little less harshly, and say we would like further time in which to consider this matter, according to report cited.

Chairman Finley: I want to let him know we did not take action with regard to the two, and add another sentence and say that we are enclosing this memorandum which gives our ideas as to how the tract should be developed.

Mr. Hudnut: That is quite enough, I should think.

Chairman Finley: Why don't you give me that now, and I will incorporate it and send it along with this?

Mr. Caemmerer: Do you have a carbon of that?

Mr. Peets: Yes

Chairman Finley: Are you here to talk about Meridian Hill Park?

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 11, 1954

Dear Mr. Secretary:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on December 17, 1953, the Office of National Capital Parks, National Park Service, submitted a design suggesting a location for the United States Marine Corps War Memorial on the Nevius Tract, north of the Arlington National Cemetery.

The Commission approved locating the memorial on the Nevius Tract, and a report was sent to the Office of National Capital Parks accordingly at that time. The exact location subsequently agreed upon is the one recommended by the sculptor of the memorial, as indicated in a landscape plan prepared by Mr. Horace W. Peaslee, which was submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts and approved at a meeting held on January 28, 1954. That site is the one at which the ground-breaking ceremony took place on February 19, 1954.

At the meeting of the Commission held on December 17, 1953, the Office of National Capital Parks also suggested that two other memorials be placed on the Nevius Tract; namely, the proposed memorial to the Five Freedoms, and the proposed Carillon Tower, in which is to be installed the carillon presented to this Government by the Government of the Netherlands. The Commission took no action with reference to these two proposed memorials, as stated in the report made to the Office of National Capital Parks.

The attention of the Commission has been called to a bill, H. J. Res. 356, introduced by Congressman D'Ewart, on January 20, 1954, "authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to authorize erection of a memorial gift from the people of the Netherlands" and containing the following provision:

"Sec. 2. The design and site of such memorial shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and the National Capital Planning Commission, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of this memorial."

I hope, when this bill is referred to your Department for comment, that you will ask that Section 2 of the bill be amended to require that the design of the proposed memorial shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, as required by the Act of Congress, approved May 17, 1910 (36 Stat., p. 371).

The Commission is prepared to give further consideration to the location and design of the proposed memorial when a plan has been submitted by the Office of National Capital Parks, as requested at the meeting held by the Commission on December 17, 1953.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
Sgd. David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Douglas McKay
Secretary of the Interior
Department of the Interior EXHIBIT D
Washington 25 D. C.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 15, 1954

My dear Mr. Lewis:

I am enclosing a copy of a letter dated March 11th, which I am sending to the Secretary of Interior with reference to the location of memorials on the Nevius Tract, north of Arlington National Cemetery.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

Hon. Orme Lewis
Assistant Secretary
Department of Interior
Washington, D. C.

def/pav

LETTER TO MARINE ASSOCIATION
ON LANDSCAPE PLAN

TO BE ADDED LATER

Letter cannot be located - therefore omitted.

Landscape Plan for Marine Memorial

Chairman Finley: Are you here to talk about Meridian Hill Park?

Mr. Feaslee: Primarily to get your final approval or get approval on the near final plan of the Marine Memorial.

Chairman Finley: Will you go ahead, please?

Mr. Feaslee: Have you the plan previously submitted, Mr. Caemmerer?

Mr. Caemmerer: Yes

Mr. Feaslee: This, for your general information, is the plan which you approved in principle, underneath. There have been subsequent developments. The first development was that the National Park Service found that they did not own the property which had been turned over. That much was lost (indicating). The second development was that the Planning Commission advised that there was a state highway encroachment pending and that wiped this corner off here (indicating). The third development was that the Marine Corps got quite enthusiastic about the possibilities of the parade ground and they expressed their limits in three stages, winding up with a parade ground 150 feet by 400 feet. That overlaps the first plan submitted. The fourth encroachment was this threatened plan for the E Street Bridge approach which was to cut right across like this (indicating) and which I think Mr. Finley and his cohorts rather dented yesterday at the hearing.

So, we had the project approved in principle, but it was hit both coming and going. That is, space was reduced and requirements increased. Aside from that, we went ahead. This is the development as it stands, as of this time. I might add that although I have been doing this kind of work for a long time, I felt that the importance of this project called for technical collaboration and I have invited a Landscape Architect to collaborate with me on the plan. I have made about nine or ten progressive studies with various revisions. This plan is the one I am now submitting.

Here are some sections, giving the sections at right angles through the axis, showing the existing grades and proposed grades. The north-south section shows quite a fill on the north site. In general it runs very close. This is changed from a mound, from a mounded setting for the monument to one which is brought down close to the ground. It is only three steps above the parade ground and all semblance of the mound has been changed.

This profile, these sections will give an idea of the general character. From this side you can view it in silhouette against the sky. The Corps will turn its back on the monument but the spectators will see the whole thing, on the stage.

From Transcript of
March 11, 1954

Mr. Hudnut: I must say that leaves something to be desired, they ought to face the monument. The reviewers should be there (indicating).

Mr. Peaslee: I had the reviewers there but, as the spectators were going to be over here, the troops should face the spectators, not have their backs to spectators. Troops all face this way.

Mr. Hudnut: I think emotionally that is wrong, symbolic.

Mr. Peaslee: That can be handled another way. The troops can form at either end and view can be had from either side. That is quite a problem in itself because for years they have been forming with the review here, they have been forming from this end, not "by the book". Now they do not know whether they are going to go by the book or go from this end or not. But either way it will work out. This plan shows at the north and south ends, a lane for buses. It will require nine buses to bring the Marine band and troops here for parades and it will probably be as many more buses for spectators. They can be lined up on either side of the traffic. This is one-way traffic.

Mr. Neild: May I ask you a question here? The grade here is 92. What are these grades along here, approximately?

Mr. Peaslee: Along the highway here is about 96. There is quite a drop in through here and it is a question of whether we can fill in here.

Mr. Belluschi: This is a literal supposition of what has happened and does not generate its emotion other than through --

Mr. Neild: It is a story.

Mr. Belluschi: So that this performs a fairly consistent purpose with the parade ground. I would agree with you in other cases.

Mr. Peets: Our first approval.

Mr. Belluschi: It is not esthetic. It is a literary interpretation or experience. It goes well with everything that goes along with that kind of setting.

Mr. Peets: I feel that raising the height of this podium for the statue as shown in these sections here, that that breaks down the separation between them because there is less difference in the ground level. There is more friendliness in them. I like the line of this being close to the ground because this statue is something that the Marines like. They like those boys up there doing their stuff. This is not the statue of an emperor which would be detached from the vulgar crowd.

Mr. Hudnut: I agree with that.

Mr. Feets: It is landscape -- it is soft and runs through and there are vistas. --

Mr. Biddle: You think the solution is what? What is the solution to get them?

Mr. Belluschi: I wanted you to give me a good argument for not raising this another two or three steps because I think that especially in this direction, I realize your feelings about this but I do not think two or three steps will do any damage to the view from here, especially from this restricted area there.

Mr. Feets: Well, in the first place, the general sense of the whole composition has had the fault that this was raised well above this, of their not getting together. They have too much differentiation. It is hard to see the construction that pulls them together, whereas, when you drop this and reduce those differences, then it becomes less a question of an oval here and the parallelogram here, but of a general flow of space which has its principal interest and objective in these beautiful distant views.

Mr. Belluschi: But you do not come here to see the view. That is very good as background, your main focus.

Mr. Feets: If you are going to this point, Pietro, you are going to look at views. You can't help it because it is absolutely stunning and moving and attractive to the eye.

Mr. Belluschi: You are not obliterating them altogether but you are giving less emphasis by lowering it.

Mr. Feaslee: May I suggest a possible compromise? You would like to have two more steps at least and Mr. Feets would like to leave it as it is. In fact, a very sharp grade of one foot here, I think it would be possible to add two more five inch steps there without changing the elevation of the platform.

Mr. Feets: Also if you changed the slope of this, would you leave that right where it is and bring that up?

Mr. Feaslee: You could do it either way. You can drop the grade and add two more steps, five steps instead of three, and without changing the elevation at all --

Mr. Feets: Why don't you raise that a couple of feet?

Mr. Feaslee: Raise what?

Mr. Feets: The parade ground.

Mr. Feaslee: I lowered it three feet to save \$25,000. That is a good answer to that. That represents the exact balance now that they have got, the minimum, adjustment of a couple of feet.

Mr. Peets: I am a little reluctant to see the thing designed as a compromise.

Mr. Peaslee: We need not change the elevation. You can take it up right here. You have a foot difference right here. That is a very sharp grade from the top of the steps down to the field as a result of grading the field. You can get two more steps here without changing the elevation of this at all so you get the effect of the height.

Mr. Peets: But the effect from that point is not what Belluschi was talking about. It is the failure to seem well elevated above its foreground. That could be done by moving it against the hill, of course, engineeringwise, it could, but --

Mr. Feaslee: I meant to drop the foreground, too.

Mr. Peets: It is the absolute elevation of the ground around it.

Mr. Belluschi: I am not insisting because I have not been there critically since then, but my feeling, simply seeing the section is that it would be better and not lose what we are striving for if it was raised. But, as you say, the grade would be raised by 14 inches. I am not going to insist at all.

Mr. Feaslee: What would you think of putting two more steps on this side only and not on the other side?

Mr. Belluschi: I do not think that would be bad at all. It would not do what I had in mind, but that is something else.

Mr. Feaslee: That is a very sharp slope there and five steps there would do it, I think.

Mr. Biddle: Mr. Chairman, could I say just a word? It seems to me we have been talking to some extent about two different conceptions, that is the perfect location of the statue or the monument and its relation to the parade ground. Now, personally, I am much more interested myself in the best place for the monument and not think particularly of the conception of the parade ground and I would like to hear the sculptor's own feeling about how he thinks his sculpture could best be presented.

Chairman Finley: Would you like to give us your views, Mr. de Weldon?

Mr. de Weldon: I like the location of the statue. I would like to see it raised another foot, if possible, and I wonder if the parade ground could not extend over this way so that the setting of the statue becomes more a part of the whole than being set apart?

Mr. Feaslee: We have just fixed the elevation on 100 at the base of the statue at your request, Felix, all the foundation calculations are now re-adjusted to elevation 100 for the base of the statue.

Mr. de Weldon: You mentioned that the impression could be given of additional heights by adding some more steps. I am not speaking of absolute measurement, but relations with the other dimensions.

Mr. Peaslee: I think 95 percent of the people who will see this, all from this side, that effect you want will be gained by having two more steps on this thing without changing the level of the platform at all.

Mr. de Weldon: The other thing I wanted to say is, could't this piece of land drop in here so that this will become part of it instead of having trees here, open it up?

Mr. Peaslee: That is something between the landscape architects.

Mr. Neild: Let me ask a question, if I may, without interrupting anyone. The view of this monument, these highways in the foreground and from way back, the Mall, let us say, would it be improved by raising the monument?

Mr. Belluschi: Can't see it anyway.

Mr. Peaslee: You can barely see the monument from over here and the monument is going to be lost against the background of the trees. It will be from about here (indicating).

Mr. Neild: Not hidden from these highways?

Mr. Peaslee: From here you will begin to about pick it up, but it is just a fast glance because if you let your eye wander there, you will be subject to an accident.

Mr. Belluschi: It is an important glance, nevertheless, because there will be 100 to 1, probably more.

Mr. Peaslee: There is the point of approach down in here.

Mr. Peets: From that point of view a discussion of a foot up or foot down has no meaning. In the distant views, it takes five feet or something like that to really be noticeable. Whereas, in the nearby views, a foot may be extremely important to the effect of the memorial and I think should be designed for that purpose.

Mr. de Weldon: What is the comment on opening up that space here so this would become part of the rest of it, instead of having two separate designs?

Mr. Peaslee: The section shows that trees do not encroach. There is a wide space there. These are full grown trees. Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Peets felt that would be improved, that that should be brought in here and there to give us a sense of engagement and giving more scale.

Mr. Peets: The monument is larger if the space that it occupies is smaller.

Mr. Feaslee: The trees would be trimmed high so the views would be seen through there.

Mr. de Weldon: Actually, this separation would not appear on the grounds. It appears on the drawings.

Mr. Feaslee: The lawns will carry right back under the trees.

Mr. Peets: That is necessary in order to get those views of the city which are such a stunning part of the composition.

Mr. Feaslee: The views off in this direction are very incidental. Another thing, here are these great apartments. They are in the background, so by the time you get the trees in there, you reduce that background.

Chairman Finley: Has there been sufficient meeting of the minds that you are ready to take action on this? You would like some action taken on this?

Mr. Peaslee: I would like to get this cleared

(one page of the transcript missing and cannot be located)

? suggestion of other purposes and I think the relations of the monument, its entourage to the parade ground is inorganic and should be further studied, and I think the position of the reviewing stand in competition of the monument will be very, very unhappy, very unfortunate.

Chairman Finley: Do you want to express your views?

Mr. Belluschi: I am sorry that I disagree. I think I see the point and I would agree in principle, but in this particular example here, I think both the stand and the parade ground serve not primarily and all the time as a parade grounds and a platform but as for ground and background respectively depending from which side you see it. The monument itself dominates the environment there to such a point that I do not think the other will interfere with it under normal conditions. As a work of art, it is one that will generate, it does not generate its own emotional other than through the connection, the historical connection, the emotional connections which are literary rather than esthetical. Therefore, it is quite logical and seems rather consistent that symbolic power of the monument which is historical be completed by the parades and all the other things which one may or may not agree but are part of the same sort of attitude of worshipping the past and trying to bring it to being and symbolizing it and so on. So I see no consistency and I think it is, especially in view of the fact that the sculptor approved it and therefore brings to being a kind of environment which he expected. I am ready to approve the resolutions, the plan as submitted.

Chairman Finley: Elbert, would you like to say anything further?

Mr. Feets: No.

Chairman Finley: Gentlemen, you made a motion and Mr. Neild seconded it, to approve the design. All in favor say aye, opposed, no.

Mr. Feets: Aye

Mr. Biddle: Aye

Mr. Belluschi: Aye

Mr. de Weldon: Aye

Mr. Hudnut: No.

Chairman Finley: I agree with the views of the majority on this particular monument. I do not believe it would be so much harm as in other types of monuments. Thank you very much, Horace.

Meridian Hill Park

Mr. Feaslee: Do you wish to discuss Meridian Hill possibilities today? I have sent to all members of the Commission, each member of the Commission, a copy of the plan and also a copy of a memorandum which was compiled for a committee of this Commission which included Mr. Gilmore Clarke, Mr. Paul Manship, and Mr. Borie:

The Commission, in 1939, took certain action about Meridian Hill and asked me to summarize the action, which I did. You have all received copies of that. Most of the findings of your committee at that time seemed to me to have lapsed. Now, in a note which I prepared for Mr. Caemmerer at one time, I mentioned that the Secretary of the Commission was the head of the Park Service under the old Office of Public Buildings and grounds. At that time there was a very close liaison between the prescription and the execution of the work which now seems to have lapsed, and I have wondered whether this report, which is a case in point, might be reopened and that this Commission might look over the findings of the previous Commission and substantiate, call attention to them, "revive them"; and that, incidentally, bears on the question which you raised, which you expected to act on today on the location, possible location of this carillon in Meridian Hill Park.

I was asked to come back on this date to bring to your attention the sites, possible sites, for the carillon in Meridian Hill which I have done in the memorandum. That bears partly on the location of the Jeanne D'Arc statue which was put on that hillside before any structure had been attempted.

Mr Belluschi: Where is the Jeanne D'Arc?

Mr. Feaslee: Right here, and perhaps this will best illustrate my point. The statue is utterly lost. The horse's head peers over the fence. I have here some letters from Paul Cret. He expected to do the French Embassy across the way.

Mr. Biddle: Would you mind pointing again to where the Jeanne D'Arc is?

Mr. Feaslee: On that big terrace. Paul Cret felt -- and he sent me some sketches -- he felt that Jeanne D'Arc should be located at the north end of the park. There were three sites which he recommended, favoring the site on the center. The Commission at that time, however, felt that it would be better to locate the statue at this point in the lower garden, right here. It is a very small statue and it needs intimate surroundings where you can get closer to it. If it were down here, I do not think it would be subject to much damage as it has been up here. It has been vandalized several times, the sword broken and so forth.

Chairman Finley: Where is its present location?

Mr. Feaslee: Right there. You can get a glimpse of the horse's head, and it is utterly lost. Few people know it is there. It was put there

when it was a bare hillside so there is some reason for it. If that is brought down here, there remain three possible sites. If you go to an actual site, well, there is an obvious site over here near the Netherlands Embassy -- no, the Chancery.

I would like to say one thing more: I 'lived' with this Commission for about 25 years when we were doing this plan. It was all developed stage by stage and at that time a concert pavillion, a temple of music, was scheduled to be here, a temple not being ideal form for a concert but it was at that time approved. This was designed as a concert grove. It all goes back to the time when Mrs. Taft was fostering concerts down in West Potomac Park around the polo ground and at that time they were driving down in open carriages just as they were driving on Pincian Hill to hear the concerts. At one time, this was designed with roads coming into the park. The final scheme was a place for pedestrians, for concerts where they were high above the city, they could have fountains at the end like the Medici Fountains playing water; lovely views of the city, and the cool breezes and so forth, and an ideal place for concerts. That seems to have gone by the board. The place has been taken over by an undesirable element.

(discussion off the record)

Mr. Feaslee: It needs light at night. Whites do not like to go in there in the evening any more because it is not properly policed. So we will say that is out of it. If that is out of it, you have a climax which does not lead any where. Now, one point is: could the tower go in place of the pontoon? If it did go there, would seats on this terrace under this grove be too close? Would it be overwhelming, would people be overwhelmed by the sound of the bells? Incidentally, I mentioned in my memorandum that the architect was not responsible for any engineering on this idea. He was responsible only for visible things, form, color, and texture; Vitale did the planting and Park Engineers did the structure. Due to settlements, it looks like two cakes of ice on which Eliza crossed the river. It has not been corrected. It is a \$2 million dollar public garden and it is a shame the way it looks. It has never been carried through to completion. There is one point for the tower here that you might consider. There is another point over at the north end of the park.

Mr. Caemmerer: Please put a big mark on there.

Mr. Feaslee: There is one point and here is another point here.

Mr. Belluschi: For the tower.

Mr. Peaslee: For the tower. Those are in a formal line.

Chairman Finley: Could I ask one question there? If you put the tower there where the red mark is, would a tower go with this composition?

Mr. Feaslee: It complicates things.

Chairman Finley: Would it be desirable?

Mr. Feaslee: I am not sure that the climax is altogether there. Both these points are in perspective. This cascade is in perspective. The mall is in perspective. There is a climax of some kind here; whether that climax is sufficient in the Mall treatment or in the cascades remains to be seen but I am not advancing this. I say that here is a site and here is another site.

Chairman Finley: If you put it on the north site it would not be seen from the steps.

Mr. Feaslee: In the distance you would not see it. This third site, which Mr. Feets has advocated very strongly, is entirely off any relationship to the formal scheme. We had an idea at one time that it might be tied on to the terrace but that is not possible because of the shape of this terrace at the end which would not permit any joining. But a completely detached tower could go over on the axis of Belmont street; you could not get on the axis of 15th Street, but there is plenty of room for it over here. These are the three sites. The only question in my mind is if that is too close to the place of rendezvous around here for enjoyment of the bells; this is almost the same distance as the first site.

Mr. Belluschi: That will mean that you will have Jeanne D'Arc moved to the lower place from there?

Mr. Feaslee: Moved down here.

Chairman Finley: In any event, that should be done?

Mr. Peaslee: No question about it. I think it is entirely wrong up there.

Chairman Finley: It seems to me that the site on the north end would be best because they would not be deafening there and it does not interfere with the central composition.

Mr. Peaslee: The Netherlands Chancery is over there.

Mr. Belluschi: It would have some meaning there.

Mr. Peaslee: There is plenty of room there and you can hear the whole length. That brings up one more point. If you will refer to the plans I sent out, you will see that they call for a line of trees on both sides of that Mall. The reason for that is that this is a big, open space and there are benches all along here and in hot summers you simply cannot use the west side in the morning or the east side in the afternoon. The previous commission agreed that to make this park usable, two lines of trees should be planted inside the Mall walk. Then there will be shade on those benches. I feel very strongly about it. To see that park half unused is inexcusable. That is merely one of the things that has been sidetracked. The other things I want to bring to your attention include this, that the early commission said, "Here is a chance to dispose of all the hodge-podge of memorials thrown at us from year to year. Let us concentrate them and make this a place for statuary - busts and urns - in niches".

So I provided niches in the wall hedges - eight of them. I saw one item in the paper about such a bust of Goethe. I sent it down to Mr. Caemmerer -- the previous commission said that it was to go in Meridian Hill. I do not know what became of it -- where did it go?

Mr. Caemmerer: I think the Smithsonian took care of it and it went back to Germany.

Mr. Feaslee: "Serenity" was dropped over here and "Serenity" is smeared with lipstick all the time and children climb over it.

Mr. Belluschi: You do not have a photograph of "Serenity"?

Mr. Feaslee: Not today.

Mr. Peets: It is charming.

Mr. Feaslee: If it were bronze, the children climbing over it would polish it up; but I do not like them climbing over marble.

Chairman Finley: A policeman to patrol the park would be a desirable thing.

Mr. Feaslee: I think that the sculptor member of the commission from year to year would be much interested in developing what this previous commission suggested in 1939. The development of a scheme for sculpture for Meridian Hill Park just as there is a scheme for plantings up there. Any number of things have been pointed out. Manship urged putting sculpture in the terrace niches at the heads of the lateral ascents. I have a wonderful photograph of Manship posing as a statue in that position. There are so many places where sculpture can be worked in. My general recommendation at this time is that you take a revived interest in Meridian Hill.

Mr. Belluschi: This newspaper clipping might lead you to believe that somebody made a decision already.

Mr. Feaslee: I do not know. That may be misinformation.

Chairman Finley: It never was brought to the commission that they would even put the carillon temporarily down here in Potomac Park. I would think that should have been brought to us before decision was reached because it may remain there for years.

Mr. Peets: There is a little point there that apparently has not been revealed. Prince Ferdinand was in town at the time and I think it is entirely possible that he and the President, for example, considered the matter and the Prince made a suggestion and the President thought it was fine and gave a ring to the National Park Service or something and lo and behold, it was done.

Mr. Feaslee: Potomac Park. How about that area? Isn't it in the path of the airlines?

Mr. Feets: The theory I have does not conflict with the idea that it is a bad suggestion. I am just trying to account for it historically.

Chairman Finley: Are you prepared to make a recommendation yourself as to the best location provided the carillon goes into Meridian Hill Park?

Mr. Feaslee: I am not. I think probably there seems to be a climax at the Mall head, but I think probably that site is off. I would like to have the views of the Commission on the north mall site. If, as Mr. Feets has suggested, that the tower should be entirely detached from the composition of the park, the only place it can go is on the side hill, at one side. If it is entirely detached should it be in harmony, in harmonious materials, or just in design, or shouldn't it be something entirely different. If it goes at the north and I think it could be very well centered, a reasonable tie-in, something to be enjoyed at a distance. I do not know where you should enjoy it to best advantage. Along 15th Street, it might be overwhelming to houses across the street.

Chairman Finley: I suggest we go up to Meridian Hill Park next month when we hope the weather will be better and make up our minds.

Mr. Feaslee: This is a photo of a model of the park sent up to the Architectural League and destroyed by fire.

Mr. Belluschi: I would like to give my intuitive reaction to this for what it is worth. I think I would depend very much on design of this area and the design of the tower will be affected by the location. But I feel that the climax point at the Mall head will be almost an impossible problem for anyone. I would be quite against it just on principle. Perhaps somebody can do a good job of it. The other site at the north end of the Mall is a better location but again that will depend on what kind of design there will be for the tower, and I favor very much the third location, one Mr. Feets suggested, of a tower that will have no relation design-wise to the whole garden; and then, as a matter of fact, it could be an invitation to be quite free in form, quite a clear and fresh one supporting, and that, of course, depends on who gets it and who designs it; but I prefer that as a concept of not locating it too formally with respect to the very formal gardens.

Mr. Feaslee: I might say one more thing about this concert platform in the final design, it was made a platform about 50 feet in diameter with no structure on it. It was supposed to be a place for various events, music, plays, or perhaps for curbstone speeches as in Hyde Park, London.

Chairman Finley: I promise you we will take an interest in Meridian Hill Park. I quite agree that something should be done about it. Would you like to go with us when we go?

Mr. Feaslee: I would like very much to go through the park and point out some of these things. I think if you keep your little plans and the memoranda, there are A B C references there. I think you can follow straight through.

Mr. Neild: In the meantime, will the carillon be erected on something temporary?

Chairman Finley: Apparently, they are going ahead with that in Potomac Park. Mr. Caemmerer, you might find out from Mr. Thompson if they are going ahead with that temporary location in Potomac Park.

Mr. Belluschi: Should not the temporary tower come, even if it is temporary, to us? You know what temporary means in Washington. Should that not come to the Commission?

Chairman Finley: I think it should. Would you ask Mr. Thompson when he is prepared to show us the design for the temporary tower and recommendations for locating it there? I think he should come here. You might invite him to the April meeting.

Mr. Caemmerer: Surely.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 16, 1954

Dear Admiral Kinkaid:

I am enclosing, for the information of your Commission, a copy of a letter to the Commission of Fine Arts from Messrs. Moore and Hutchins of New York, architects of the American Cemetery at Carthage, North Africa, together with a copy of our reply.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid, Vice-Chairman
The American Battle Monuments Commission
Navy Building
18th and Constitution Avenue, N. W.
Washington 25, D. C.

def/pav

SEE MINUTES OF JANUARY 28, 1954, FOR COPY OF LETTER

EXHIBIT G

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 22, 1954

Dear Colonel Gaynor:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 11, 1954, approved the plaster model which you submitted for the National Security Medal, as well as the model for a device for a "second award."

It was noted that this model was made at the United States Mint in Philadelphia. As you know, the Commission made several suggestions in matters of detail, which we recommended be taken into consideration in the final execution of the Medal.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Colonel Robert M. Gaynor,
Chairman, CIA Honor Awards Board,
Central Intelligence Agency,
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 22, 1954

Dear Mr. DuBois:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on March 11, 1954, approved the revised models which you submitted for the obverse and reverse of the proposed Korean Service Medal.

Regarding the model for the reverse, the suggestion was made for slightly deeper and wider incising.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Arthur E. DuBois, Chief,
Heraldic Branch, Research
and Development Division,
Department of the Army,
Washington 25, D. C.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 22, 1954

Dear Colonel Martz:

In further reference to your letter of February 19, 1954 (Reference QMGM 421.4, Arlington N/C Amphitheater), with which you submitted a design for a canopy to cover the sidewalk and leading up the steps to the West Entrance of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, I have to report that the Commission of Fine Arts considered the design at their meeting on March 11, 1954.

The Commission approved the design, with the understanding that the canopy will be used only temporarily on special occasions.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Colonel John D. Martz Jr., QMC,
Chief, Memorial Division,
Office of Quartermaster General,
Department of the Army,
Washington 25, D. C.

NATIONAL COMPETITIONFORUNITED STATES POSTAGE STAMP DESIGNS

The Postmaster General announces a national competition for designs of postage stamps to be administered with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The purpose of the competition which is open to all citizens of the United States is to secure allegorical designs representative of the American Way of Life and suitable for reproduction as postage stamps.

Requirements

1. All designs shall be submitted in the form of black and white wash drawings (not watercolor), size of design 3.75 x 4.35 inches, on white bristol board or similar paper sufficiently stiff to remain flat, preferably with a dull mat finish. The overall size of the entries shall not exceed 8 by 10 inches. Each design shall be accompanied by a photograph reduced to the approximate size of a stamp, 0.75 by 0.87 inches.

2. The words "United States Postage" or "U. S. Postage" and a denominational numeral together with the word "cent(s)" or the symbol "¢" must be incorporated in each design.

3. Contestants are advised that the designs must be suitable for reproduction by means of steel engraved printing.

4. Each drawing shall bear a device or nom-de-plume on the reverse side. The participants shall submit with each entry a sealed opaque envelope marked on the outside with the device or nom-de-plume identical to that appearing on the drawing. The envelope shall contain a card bearing the name and address of the participant.

5. The drawings shall be securely packaged to insure against tearing or folding. Entries must be submitted by registered mail, with return receipt card, addressed as follows:

Chairman, Postage Stamp Design Competition
Room _____

Washington 25, D. C.

6. All entries must be received, or postmarked, not later than _____.

7. No entry will be given consideration unless the submitting artist has complied with all the foregoing requirements.

* * * * *

JUDGING

1. All entries will be reviewed by a panel of seven judges, one of whom will be designated as chairman, all to be appointed by the Postmaster General with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts.

2. The sealed envelope submitted with each entry containing the identity of the contestant will remain unopened until such time as the judges have made a determination with respect to all entries.

3. The panel will notify the Postmaster General by memorandum, signed by all members, of the name of the artist whose design has been selected by majority vote. Announcement of the winner of the competition will be made by the Postmaster General on _____, and all participants will be notified by letter of the name of the winning artist.

4. Rejected designs will be returned by the Postmaster General upon written request of the artist within 30 days following public announcement of the award.

* * * * *

AWARDS

1. The design which in the opinion of the judges is most meritorious will be purchased by the United States Government for \$1,000 and shall become the exclusive property of the Government. However, the right to reject all of the designs is reserved to the panel of judges if in its opinion none of the drawings is deemed suitable for the purpose.

2. The Government reserves the right to purchase at a price of \$300 any design submitted other than the one which has been selected as the winner, and the design(s) so purchased shall become the exclusive property of the Government.

3. The Government further reserves the right to make such revisions in the designs as may be required.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 18, 1954

Dear Mr. Robertson:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on March 11th, the Commission gave careful consideration to the draft of a Program of Competition for new postage stamps, which was received from you.

Before commenting on the draft, the Commission feel that it is of the utmost importance that a Professional Advisor be appointed to conduct the competition. The Commission hope that the Postmaster General will ask Dr. Fiske Kimball, Director of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to perform this service.

Dr. Kimball is highly experienced in such work; he has the confidence of the Commission of Fine Arts and of leading artists of this country, and his appointment, we feel, would assure success of the competition. I am certain Dr. Kimball would serve without compensation, although he would, of course, expect to be reimbursed for travel expenses incurred in coming to Washington. We hope the Post Office Department can arrange to do this.

I wish to assure you that the members of the Commission of Fine Arts are deeply interested in the proposed competition, and wish to cooperate with you and Mr. Hall of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to the fullest extent.

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable A. J. Robertson
Assistant Postmaster General
Washington, D. C.

HPC:DEF:PAV

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine N. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

- 1 Bronze ting, Chinese, Shang dynasty.
- 1 Bronze mechanical device, silver inlaid, Chinese, Han dynasty.
- 1 Jade jue, Chinese, Chin dynasty.
- 1 Jade chung, Chinese, Chin dynasty.
- 1 Jade mask, Chinese, Shang dynasty.
- 1 Jade rectangular piece, Chinese, Shang dynasty.
- med
du
154* { ~~1 Porcelain plate, bound with metal, Chinese, Sung dynasty, Ting yao.~~
- ~~1 Porcelain dish, conical, Chinese, Sung dynasty, Hsuan ware (Ting Yao?),~~

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

December 8, 1953

Leonard Carmichael, Secretary
For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

March 11, 1954

David E. Finley, Chairman
For the Commission of Fine Arts.

December 7, 1953

Katharine N. Rhoades

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine N. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

- 1 Persian pottery plate from Nishapur.
- 1 Vase, blue-and-white, Chinese, Ming dynasty.
- 1 Candle-stick, silver inlaid bronze, Persian, 13th c.
- 1 Candle-stick, silver inlaid bronze, Persian, 12th c.
- 1 Koran, illuminated, Turkish, middle 16th c.
- 5 Folders of 79 Kaswini Manuscripts

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

March 11, 1954

David E. Finley, Chairman
For the Commission of Fine Arts.
